

Appl. No. 09/818,125  
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of January 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0191  
Customer No.: 26021

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 9, 2006 and Advisory Action dated May 4, 2006. Claims 1-23 remain in this application. Claims 1, 16, 22, and 23 are the independent Claims. It is believed that no new matter is involved in the amendments or arguments presented herein. Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are respectfully requested.

#### Claim Objection

Claim 16 was objected to because of an informality. In response, Claim 16 was amended to address that informality in reply to Final Office Action dated January 9, 2006. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objection are thus respectfully requested.

#### Art-Based Rejections

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,401,074 (Sleeper) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,603 (Hunter); Claims 22-23 were rejected under 103(a) over Hunter in view of Sleeper.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and submits that the claims herein are patentable in light of the clarifying amendments above and the arguments below.

#### The Sleeper Reference

Sleeper is directed to a method and system for displaying and/or broadcasting promotional and informational messages to a customer during a retail transaction. (See, *Sleeper*; Col. 1, lines 5-10). According to Sleeper, an augmented point-of-sales

Appl. No. 09/818,125  
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of January 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0191  
Customer No.: 26021

(POS) system including capabilities for real-time displaying and broadcasting of commercial information is provided. Each front-end POS is augmented with an auxiliary display for presenting promotional information to a customer during the course of a retail transaction. (*See, Sleeper; Col. 1, lines 51-57*).

### The Hunter Reference

Hunter is directed to a system and method of permitting commercial advertisers to directly send advertisements electronically to the network for display at locations and times selected by the advertisers. (*See, Hunter; Col. 1, 7-18*). According to Hunter, the system includes a network having a plurality of electronic displays. A customer of the system accesses the system via the internet. (*See, Hunter; Col 2, lines 50-66; Col. 2, line 66 – Col. 3, line 6; Fig. 1*).

### The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

The present application is generally directed to a system and method for printing advertising information on a receipt issued by a point-of-service (POS) terminal.

As defined by independent Claim 1, a network system has a server system connectable to a client PC via the Internet and to a POS system having a POS terminal device. The POS terminal device has at least a display device and a printing device. The network system includes a first server providing (a) means for storing an application page containing an advertising placement application form, and (b) means for sending the application page containing the application form to the client PC in response to a request from the client PC. A second server, separate from the first server, provides (c) means for receiving and storing input information containing advertising placement information provided by the client PC in

Appl. No. 09/818,125  
Amdt. Dated June 9, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of January 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0191  
Customer No.: 26021

accordance with the application form. A central computer, separate from the first and second servers, provides (d) means for distributing specific data in the input information to a POS system in a specified area specified by the client PC. The second server provides (e) control means for controlling printing the advertising placement information on the POS system receiving the distribution.

Independent Claim 1 recites, "a first server providing...a second server, separate from the first server, providing...a central computer, separate from the first and second servers, providing: (d) means for distributing specific data in the input information to a POS system in a specified area specified by the client PC..."

The Advisory Action agrees that Sleeper does not disclose or suggest the central computer recited in independent Claim 1. The Advisory Action thus identifies Hunter as disclosing that feature. (*See, Advisory Action; lines 10-11*).

Applicant notes that Hunter discloses a system 20 for direct placement of commercial advertisement, and server 100 for providing content to LED displays 30. (*See, Hunter; Fig. 1*). The server enables the display of the LED display, regardless of the number of viewers and type of viewers. In short, a LED display cannot target the intended audience, and such determination is left the customer with the information collected. (*See, Hunter; Fig. 1, Reference elements 150, 160, 170, 190*).

In contrast, Applicant notes that the means for distributing specific data include, *inter alia*, information to target specific types of customers. (*See, Specification; Page 14, last paragraph – Page 15, line 2; Page 15, lines 10-15*). In particular, the advertising placement information provided by the client PC includes the information specifying the advertising target. When a customer or a transaction at a specific POS matches the advertising target, the specific data is distributed to that POS by the central computer. A LED display lacks that feature

Appl. No. 09/818,125

Amdt. Dated June 9, 2006

Reply to Final Office Action of January 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0191

Customer No.: 26021

required by independent Claim 1, and thus cannot constitute the central computer recited in that claim.

Accordingly, Sleeper and Hunter cannot be said to disclose or suggest the features recited in independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the applied references do not disclose or suggest the features of independent Claim 1. That claim is thus believed to be allowable over the applied references, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 16, 22, and 23 similarly reciting "the central computer," are also allowable over the applied references.

The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 and 16, and recite additional features of the invention which are neither disclosed nor fairly suggested by the applied references and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6809 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 09/818,125

Amdt. Dated June 9, 2006

Reply to Final Office Action of January 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81747.0191

Customer No.: 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: June 9, 2006

By: 

Dariush G. Adli

Registration No. 51,386

Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701